

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

MDL No. 3084

This Order Relates To:

ALL CASES

**ORDER DENYING
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER
PARTY'S MATERIAL SHOULD BE
FILED UNDER SEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 2496

On March 14, 2025, the plaintiffs filed amended bellwether complaints that included redactions over information derived from documents produced by Uber that had been designated confidential. See dkt. 2496. Concurrently, the plaintiffs filed an administrative motion to consider whether another party's material should be sealed. Id. Per Local Civil Rule 79-5(f)(3), the Designating Party (Uber) had 7 days to file a statement describing the reasons the documents should be kept under seal. Uber has not filed a statement. Accordingly, the motion is denied. The plaintiffs are directed to file unredacted versions of the documents.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 31, 2025



CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Judge